

Further, in the unlikely event that the content of the phone call becomes relevant to an issue in this case, Plaintiff has alternative means of introducing its substance. As such, the predicted destruction of the recording would not be unduly prejudicial.


Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff David James Brodigan's Motion for a Document Subpoena (Doc. 59), is **DENIED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Ruling (Doc. 63), is **DENIED** as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Emergency Order (Doc. 65), is **DENIED**.

Dated this 21st day of October, 2019.



JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE